



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/577,032	04/20/2006	David Clayton Gantner	DC5183 PCT 1	9136
137 7590 10/06/2009 DOW CORNING CORPORATION CO1232 2200 W. SALZBURG ROAD P.O. BOX 994 MIDLAND, MI 48686-0994				
EXAMINER				
MAZUMDAR, SONYA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1791				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/06/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents.admin@dowcorning.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/577,032

Applicant(s)

GANTNER ET AL.

Examiner

SONYA MAZUMDAR

Art Unit

1791

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3-5, 7 and 19-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-5, 7 and 19-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see pages 2 and 3, filed July 14, 2009, with respect to the rejections under 102(b) have been fully considered and are persuasive, thus the rejections have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 3, 4, 5, 7, 19, 25, 27, and 29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Colas et al. (EP 0955347) in view of Johnson et al. (US 6,475,329)

Colas et al. teach a method of adhering a silicone gel to a substrate, comprising the steps of (abstract):

forming a layer of a silicone gel on a sheet (paragraphs 0028);
treating the silicone gel with an adhesion promoter (paragraphs 0025);
applying the silicone gel to a carrier (paragraph 0028);
removing the sheet from the silicone gel (paragraph 0028); and
applying the silicone gel to a substrate to which the silicone gel is adhered to (abstract; paragraph 0015).

However, Colas et al. do not specifically teach treating silicone gel on a sheet with a specific primer. However, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to do so, as Johnson et al. teach applying a primer comprising titanate and zirconate materials to silicone gels, as it would be used for improving the adhesion of silicone gels to polymeric adherends (column 1, lines 7-9 and 39-63; column 2, lines 1-26; column 5, lines 36-40).

With respect to claims 3 and 7, Colas et al. teach using a carrier or prosthesis of various types of plastic films, such as polyurethanes or silicones (paragraph 0012).

With respect to claim 4, Colas et al. teach using a prosthesis (i.e. carrier) of various materials, such as breast prosthesis, incontinence devices, pouches, tubes and other devices (Colas: paragraph 0037; Applicant's specification: paragraph 0017).

With respect to claim 5, Colas et al. teach applying a silicon gel layer with a thickness in the range of 0.2 mm to 5 mm (paragraph 0023).

With respect to claim 25, Colas et al. teach applying silicone gel with a tack in the range of 50 and 500 g. (paragraph 0024)

With respect to claims 27 and 29, Colas et al. in view of Johnson et al. teach applying a primer, diluted in alcohol, by brushing and other various methods (Colas: paragraphs 0031 and 0032; Johnson: column 3, line 63 – column 4, line 21; column 5, line 20).

6. Claims 20-24, 26, 28, and 30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Colas et al. in view of Johnson et al.

Colas et al. teach a method of adhering a silicone gel to a substrate, comprising the steps of (abstract):

forming a layer of a silicone gel on a sheet (paragraphs 0028);
applying the silicone gel on the sheet to a carrier (paragraph 0038);
removing the sheet from the silicone gel (paragraph 0028); and
applying the silicone gel to a substrate to which the silicone gel is adhered to (abstract; paragraph 0015).

However, Colas et al. do not specifically teach treating a sheet with a specific primer. However, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to

do so, as Johnson et al. teach applying a primer comprising titanate and zirconate materials to silicone gels, as it would be used for improving the adhesion of silicone gels to polymeric adherends (column 1, lines 7-9 and 39-63; column 2, lines 1-26; column 5, lines 17-31).

With respect to claims 21 and 24, Colas et al. teach using a carrier or prosthesis of various types of plastic films, such as polyurethanes or silicones (paragraph 0012).

With respect to claim 22, Colas et al. teach using a prosthesis (i.e. carrier) of various materials, such as breast prosthesis, incontinence devices, pouches, tubes and other devices (Colas: paragraph 0037; Applicant's specification: paragraph 0017).

With respect to claim 23, Colas et al. teach applying a silicon gel layer with a thickness in the range of 0.2 mm to 5 mm (paragraph 0023).

With respect to claim 26, Colas et al. teach applying silicone gel with a tack in the range of 50 and 500 g. (paragraph 0024)

With respect to claims 28 and 30, Colas et al. in view of Johnson et al. teach applying a primer, diluted in alcohol, by brushing and other various methods (Colas: paragraphs 0031 and 0032; Johnson: column 3, line 63 – column 4, line 21; column 5, line 20).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SONYA MAZUMDAR whose telephone number is (571)272-6019. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Philip Tucker can be reached on (571) 272-1095. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SM

/Philip C Tucker/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791